DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 192 730 IR 008 789

AUTHOR	Dickinson, Elizabeth M.: And Others
TITLE	Report of the Racism and Sexism in Subject Analysis Subcommittee to the RTSD/CCS Subject Analysis Committee, Midwinter 1980.
INSTITUTION	American Library Association, Chicago, Ill. Resources and Technical Services Div.
PUB DATE	80
NOTE	55p.: Best copy available.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Annotated Bibliographies: *Attitudes: Cataloging: *Classification: Indexing: *Racial Bias: *Sex Bias: *Subject Index Terms: *Vocabulary
IDENTIFIERS	Dewey Decimal Classification: Library of Congress Classification

ABSTRACT

Directed toward the eradication of sexual and racial bias in bibliographic systems, the subcommittee reports its progress in the identification of areas of classification systems and subject headings requiring change. A policy statement and six guidelines establish a framework for three categories of projects: (1) the need for changes in Library of Congress (LC) subject headings applied to materials on a wide range of racial, ethnic, and lifestyle groups: (2) the analysis of placement and terminology used to classify women and racial and ethnic minorities in both LC and Dewey schedules: and (3) the compilation of annotated bibliographies citing research already done in the area of subject analysis and terminology relating to women and Afro-Americans. Summary reports of the six subcommittee projects are followed by a listing of further research needs, general recommendations, and a summary of all subcommittee recommendations. Full reports of the subcommittee projects are attached. (RAA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED192730

REPORT OF THE

RACISM AND SEXISM IN SUBJECT ANALYSIS SUBCOMMITTEE

TO THE

RTSD/CCS SUBJECT ANALYSIS COMMITTE

MIDWINTER 1980

(Revised February 1980
with recommendations from
the Midwinter Meeting)

Subcommittee members:

Elizabeth M. Dickinson, Chairperson
Betty L. Brown
Deseretta V. McAllister
Joan K. Marshall
Jessica L. Milstead

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

William I. Bunnell

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

IR008187

INTRODUCTION

A 1976 ALA Resolution on Racism and Sexism Awareness directed the RTSD, among other ALA divisions, to assist in the process of eradicating racial and sexual discrimination. In descriptive cataloging efforts were made through the Resources and Technical Services Divison to remove race and sex-biased terminology from the Anglo American Cataloging Code. The charge was given to the Subject Analysis Committee to explore means of compliance with the ALA Resolution with regard to subject headings and classification.

In June 1977 the Subject Analysis Committee responded by appointing the Ad Hoc Racism and Sexism in Subject Analysis Subcommittee. Its function was:

> To identify areas of classification systems and subject headings which require change pursuant to the July 1976 ALA Resolution on Racism and Sexism Awareness; to establish priority ranking for making these changes; and to report these findings to the Subject Analysis Committee for transmittal via the RTSD Executive Board, to the appropriate change-making organizations.[1]

The Subcommittee held its first session at the Midwinter Meeting 1978, and has conducted nine sessions through the 1979 ALA Annual Conference. Committee members were Elizabeth M. Dickinson, Chairperson, Jessica L. Milstead, Joan K. Marshall, Deseretta V. McAllister, and Joyce N. Davis. In March 1979 Betty L. Brown was appointed to the Subcommittee to fill the unexpired term of Joyce Davis.

Committee sessions have been well attended and have generated considerable correspondence as well. The first nine meetings have attracted at least sixty-six non-committee attendees. Correspondence has ranged from proposals on specific subject heading and classification changes, to samples of classification and subject headings used in specialized collections of materials related to women, to proposals for greater LC and ALA activity in development of alternative subject analysis schemes for small and medium-sized general libraries equivalent to the Annotated Cards Program.

The initial meetings concentrated on defining the scope of the committee's charge and devising research methodologies to address that charge. The Subcommittee used the same coverage as the ALA Equal Employment Opportunity Policy in determining the groups of people that would be studied with regard to subject analysis. This policy prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, sex, creed, color, national origin, lifestyle, or handicap. Thus, the scope of the Subcommittee's work was broadened somewhat while remaining within the spirit of the Racism and Sexism Awareness Resolution. This larger pool of subject areas allowed research on the subject analysis of groups that have received very little attention to date.

Another important and guiding document for the Subcommittee is the set of "principles for establishing subject headings relating to people and peoples" drafted by Joan K. Marshall and outlined in her On Equal Terms. These guidelines have been approved and adopted in principle by the RTSD CCS Subject Analysis Committee:

1. The authentic name of ethnic, national, religious, social, or sexual groups should be established if such a name is determinable. If a group does not have an authentic name, the name preferred by the group should be established. The determination of the authentic or preferred name should be based upon the literature of the people themselves (not upon outside sources or experts), upon organizational self-identification, and/or upon group member experts.
2. In establishing subdivisions for use with the names of people or peoples, consider the connotation, in addition to the denotation, of the wording and structure of the subdivision. Avoid words that connote inferiority or peculiarity. In establishing subdivisions for concepts applicable to all classes of people, avoid variations in the structure of the subdivision under certain people or peoples. Avoid American/Western European ethnocentrism. Avoid value-loaded words; aim for neutrality.
3. The wording and structure of headings for minority or other groups should not differ from headings for the majority. Avoid all "as" and "in" constructions to describe practitioners of an activity.
4. Be specific and current. Do not use previously established terms to cover new topics.
5. Do not use subsuming terminology. Do not establish headings for some, but not all, classes of people or peoples.

6. Do not allow huge files of undifferentiated cards to accumulate under a heading. One inch of cards represents approximately 100 titles; it takes quite some time and patience on the part of a user to examine that many titles in order to select those wanted.[2]

The Subcommittee's work has been divided roughly into three categories:

1. Using various methodologies subject headings have been studied as applied by the Library of Congress to materials on a wide range of racial/ethnic/lifestyle groups to determine whether there is literary warrant for change in the headings. Need for change was also judged based upon the "Principles for Establishing Subject Headings Relating to People and Peoples," that is, whether the name is authentic and preferred by the group; whether the wording and structure used is objective and non-pejorative; whether the headings are current, specific and differentiated.

2. Both Library of Congress Classification and Dewey Decimal Classification schedules have been analyzed with regard to placement and terminology used to classify materials relating to women and, to a lesser degree, racial and ethnic minorities. This is a major, largely unexplored, area of research. Much more work will be needed in this area even after the Ad Hoc Subcommittee is discharged.

3. Annotated bibliographies of materials on subject analysis and terminology related to women and Afro-Americans have been prepared. The Subcommittee decided to spend less time in analyzing subject headings related to women and blacks because considerable research in this area has taken place. These bibliographies cite in particular the work already done by Doris H. Clack for materials on subject analysis and terminology for materials on blacks, and Joan Marshall's study on subject headings related to women. Sanford Berman and others have also contributed substantially in this area. While the Ad Hoc Subcommittee would like to do some additional work in identifying leftover problems in this area before it is discharged, the Subcommittee recognizes that the Library of Congress has made considerable headway in changing terminology for materials on women and Afro-Americans.

SUMMARY REPORTS

Full reports of Subcommittee projects are included as appendices attached to this summary. The first two documents deal with subject heading treatment for groups of people. The study of needed changes to Dewey 19th edition is included as Appendix 3, while a report on LC classification appears in Appendix 4. Attachments 6 and 7 are bibliographies of materials on subject terminology relating to women and Afro-Americans respectively. The last document pertains to remaining subject heading changes needed for materials on blacks.

These reports are abstracted and individual report recommendations are given below. To date the Subcommittee has seen and discussed these reports in preliminary form and have approved the recommendations.

Appendix 1: Treatment of People and Peoples in Subject Analysis and Literary Warrant Study

SUMMARY: Graduate Cataloging students at UCLA and Florida State University under the direction of Jessica L. Milstead and Doris H. Clack respectively analyzed subject heading and classification assigned to materials on ethnic groups, the handicapped, age and lifestyle categories. Using the "Principles for Establishing Subject Headings Relating to People and Peoples" the students studied the subject analysis used for the chosen materials to determine whether the subject headings and classification used is non-pejorative, if the vocabulary is objective, if the analysis is offensive to the group being analyzed, and if the terminology used lends itself to easy access by catalog users.

Titles were selected from recent bibliographies and then checked for Library of Congress copy through the LC or National Union Catalogs (at UCLA), or through the OCLC data base (at FSU). The groups that were studied included:

Africa and Africans
Chinese Americans
Italian Americans
Japanese Americans
Jewish Americans
Mexican Americans
Native Americans
Puerto Rican Americans
Ethnicity in America

General handicaps
Blind people
Deaf, deaf-blind, and mute people
Injuries and illnesses
Mentally disadvantaged
Physical handicaps
Gays
Senior Citizens
Teenagers

Women and blacks were not used in this study. Other approaches were to be recommended for covering these groups in the Subcommittee's report.

While the study finds that the Library of Congress has made considerable progress in changing offensive and inadequate subject headings relating to people, Library of Congress Classification requires considerable modification. The study finds that the Dewey Decimal Classification System, based on an analysis of the 18th edition, has removed most of the biased captions and placement.

A second study was conducted to fill in some of the gaps from the first project. St. John's University students under Jessica Milstead searched the LIBCON data base under such terms as gay and homosexual, handicapped and disabled, Native American and American Indian, seniors and aged, youth and adolescents, Mexican Americans and Chicanos. Titles containing words describing the group were counted in an effort to determine literary warrant for a change in terminology. Imprints of 1969 and 1977 were used to show change over time.

This second study reveals some literary warrant for the change of MEXICAN AMERICAN to CHICANO and HOMOSEXUALITY or HOMOSEXUALS to GAY LIFE-STYLE or GAYS.

The first study was published in the LRTS Fall issue.[3] The second study is also likely to be published in the near future.

RECOMMENDATIONS: The recommendations for the first study can be summarized in priority order as follows:

Subject headings:

1. Decisions affecting list structure; should be taken immediately, even if implemented piecemeal.
   - -- More synthesis of complex topics, e.g., employment of specific groups in specific occupations
   - -- Addition of scope notes
   - -- Redistribution of subdivisions so that subdivisions of negative connotation do not appear only under the names of discriminated-against minorities. Either by setting up a single list of subdivisions in the preface, or by setting up a pattern heading (which may be such a minority, so long as positive subheadings are included also)

2. Abandonment of objectification, e.g., Deaf people.

3. Rationalization of headings for senior citizens: change "Aged" to "Senior Citizens," and develop scope notes for this one, and for "Old age" and "Aging" to insure consistent application.

4. *Recommendations on names of Indian groups, and subheadings applied to them.

5. Subheadings with negative connotations (or which have been misapplied), e.g., Acculturation, Foreign population, Foreign influences.

LC classification

1. Update the H schedule
2. Change the treatment of peoples in E-F, dispersing the subjects throughout the classification where they belong. *American Indians should be treated first in this effort.

DC classification

1. Implement the revised 305-306 (not from Milstead-Clack, but this is first priority)

2. Break up indiscriminate groupings of women, slaves, and ethnic groups.

* If a choice must be made as to whether to deal with subject headings or classification for American Indians first, the Subcommittee recommends that subject headings be treated first, since these are most evident to library users.

Recommendations from the second study include:

1) Consideration of use of the term GAY based upon literary warrant. This area will receive some further study by the Subcommittee.
2) Consideration of use of the term CHICANOS based also on literary warrant. The Subcommittee cautions, however, that there is diversity of opinion within the Mexican American community, and thus the Subject Analysis Committee or LC should poll representative organizations, including REFORMA, before any change is made.
3) The Library of Congress should monitor other terms, such as those referring to youth, to determine trends in literary warrant over time and should make appropriate heading changes as warrant is established.

Appendix 2: A Review of Subject Access to American Indian Materials

SUMMARY: Initially, Joan Marshall volunteered to contact organizations representing American Indians to determine preferred terminology. This project did not receive adequate response. However, the names of these groups were analyzed: Of 59 groups the terms "American Indian" or "Indian" appears 37 times; "Native American" or "Native" comes up only 3 times; and Amerindian does not appear at all.

In addition, Ms. Marshall looked at the Library of Congress Subject Headings under INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA, INDIANS OF CENTRAL AMERICA, etc. to determine objectivity, specificity, and clarity of the terms used within the subdivisions. Difficulties were discovered in all three areas.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Experts in Indian studies should be asked to indentify non-authentic tribal and personal Indian names used in the LCSH. If a non-authentic name is not preferred by the peoples themselves, the authentic form should be established.

2. Consideration should be given to replacing the INDIANS OF... form with American, Canadian, Mexican, etc. Indians or with Indians, American; Indians, Canadian; Indians, Mexican; etc.

3. If the present primary entry point is retained, a clear distinction must be made between works on North American Indians in general and works on American or Canadian Indians specifically. For example: INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA; INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA -- UNITED STATES; or INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA; INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA (AMERICAN); INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA (CANADIAN).

The present scope note under INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA needs revision. If UNITED STATES is established as a subdivision, the note should read: "Subdivided by United States, Canada, and by states, provinces, regions, etc... ." Consideration should be given, however, to indirect subdivision of all works that would be assigned a jurisdictional subdivision. For example: INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA--UNITED STATES--MASSACHUSETTS; INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA--CANADA--BRITISH COLUMBIA. Subdivision by region should be made either directly under the basic heading in all instances (i.e. even when the region is wholly in one jurisdiction): INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA--MISSISSIPPI VALLEY and INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA--NORTHWEST COAST OF NORTH AMERICA or made in all instances under the subheading for the jurisdiction with duplicate entry as necessary: INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA--CANADA--NORTHWEST COAST OF NORTH AMERICA and INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA--UNITED STATES--NORTHWEST COAST OF NORTH AMERICA.

If the glossed form is adopted, INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA (AMERICAN), INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA (CANADIAN), the question of direct or indirect subdivision becomes moot.

4. Ethnology and Civilization and culture should be established as subdivisions.

5. Duplicate entries established to provide access to materials

by both form or topic and geographic or jurisdictional location should be specific in each instance.

6. A distinction should be made between works on contemporary and traditional Indian concerns, customs, etc. The Subcommittee recognizes that more work is needed to determine the most appropriate terminology and suggests the SAC coordinate this effort to assure consistent usage under all applicable headings.

7. Subdivisions which do not conform to LCSH patterns should be dropped; for example: LIQUOR PROBLEM and WARS. (Some LCSH patterns should be reexamined before they are expanded to cover materials on INDIANS; for example ALCOHOL AND... .)

8. Establish more scope notes defining the materials entered under a subdivision.

Appendix 3: Dewey Decimal Classification, Edition 19: Schedules Relating to Men, Women, Age Levels, and Alternative Relationships

SUMMARY: The Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC) 19th edition was reviewed in comparison with the previous edition to determine the adequacy and objectivity of the treatment given to materials on the sexes, age levels, and alternative life styles. DDC treatment of classification for racial and ethnic minority groups will be covered in a separate study.

This report finds that Dewey has taken a backward step in many respects by providing little additional specificity (and in many cases less specificity) for materials formerly classed in 301, Social Structure.

DDC 19 removes the hierarchical structure under 301.41, Relations Between the Sexes when these materials are transferred into 305.3 and 305.4. Just as MAN stands for both generic and specific in LCSH (one of the worst existing problems in that list of subject headings), so now does 305.3 stand for humankind and men.

In this report Elizabeth Dickinson presents a revamped 305/306 schedule to remedy this generic flaw and others. The new table provides greater specificity for several topics than is provided in DDC 19 (for example, under age levels and for homosexual/gay lifestyle).

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The Subject Analysis Committee endorse the alternative 305/306 schedule and forward these recommended changes to the Dewey Decimal Editorial Policy Committee with the request that they be considered for publication by the DDC Editorial Policy Committee as an alternative schedule.

2. The Subject Analysis Committee focus greater attention on needed changes in both Dewey and LC Classification. SAC's role in the area of classification should extend beyond the routine reception of reports from DDC and LC Classification representatives. The SAC should encourage committee members and others to submit analyses of the classification schedules and proposed changes for SAC's endorsement. Further, the SAC should explore with the Dewey Editorial Policy Committee and LC a more meaningful role that the Committee can play in the process of recommending and adopting schedule changes. An open, on-going dialogue between the SAC and classification editorial authorities needs to take place, just as has been established in the past several years for subject heading practice.

3. The Subcommittee recommends that the Subject Analysis Committee develop a set of principles for classification of materials relating to people or peoples analogous to those adopted for subject heading assignment.

Appendix 4: An Analysis of Class U: Military Science

Betty Brown agreed to take on a project to explore LC Classification (LCC) treatment of materials relating to women. The prospect of examining LCC seemed so massive that it seemed reasonable to examine the topic within one of the smaller schedules. Military Science, Class U, turned out to be a fortunate selection, for an increasing number of materials on women and minorities are now being published in this field, making it fertile ground as a test case. This is also a class -- and a topic area of classification for women's materials -- which have not received much formal study in the past.

This study indicates that when the U class schedule was revised in 1974 little was done to provide for new materials on such topics as women or minorities in the military. The paper cites areas of needed expansion, but also recognizes some very recent progress by LC toward rectifying these problems. The April-June 1979 LC Classification Additions and Changes List 194 covers new numbers provided for women and minorities in military administration. Some of the language in captions and the index is updated and made non-pejorative. Problems still remain with both terminology used and provision for specific numbers in the schedules and index.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The SAC is requested to forward to the Library of Congress the changes that are recommended here for Class U.

2. The SAC and the Library of Congress should use this study as an example of the kinds of changes that are likely to be needed throughout the schedules. Considerable effort will be needed by subject catalogers at LC as well as independent researchers, to ferret out and make needed changes. The author of this report recommends a methodology for classification schedule and index change: In the short run, identify schedule notations which "imply" inclusion of materials on women and, on that basis, supply "implicit indexing." In the long run, to analyze the "fundamental adequacy" of the notations in terms of initial, or "original intent" to be comprehensive.

3. A mechanism should be developed whereby the Subject Analysis Committee and the library community at large has greater input into the decision-making process for classification change. SAC should concentrate more of its energies on the classification schemes and their revision process.

Appendix 5: Annotated Bibliography of Materials Relating to Language, Subject Analysis, and Women

This annotated bibliography, prepared by Elizabeth Dickinson, covers several categories: books and articles on sexism in language; lists and thesauri; books and articles on sex-biased LCSH subject headings and alternatives for their revision; bibliographies and citations; classification schedules for women-related material.

The most comprehensive and relevant document for the purposes of the Subcommittees'work is Joan Marshall's On Equal Terms, which should be present (and much used) on every subject cataloger's desk.

Appendix 6: Bibliography of Materials on Terminology and Subject Analysis Relating to Blacks

The annotated bibliography of terminology and subject analysis of materials relating to blacks covers original research only on this topic. It recognizes that Doris H. Clack has provided a leadership role in this area.

Deseretta McAllister has prepared this annotated bibliography.

Appendix 7: Classification of Materials About Blacks Using the Dewey Decimal Classification

This report and its recommendations are in progress and will be

available at the New York Annual ALA Conference. The report is being drafted by Deseretta McAllister.

FURTHER RESEARCH NEEDS

The Subcommittee hopes to complete the following additional reports before it is discharged:

-- An analysis of further subject heading changes that are needed for materials relating to women.

-- An analysis of the HQ Library of Congress Classification schedule for treatment of women's materials.

-- A plan for publication of portions of this document. An emphasis should be placed on putting the material in a format suitable for broad dissemination throughout the library community. The Subcommittee feels that dissemination in a more "popularized" form is in the spirit of the Racism and Sexism Awareness Resolution which generated the impetus for this Subcommittee's formation.

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

1. There is considerable need for on-going research in the area of subject analysis for materials related to people and peoples. The Ad Hoc Subcommittee does not feel, however, that the answer lies in permanent status for a subcommittee under SAC. Much of the research can take place in library school programs. A substantial portion of this report could not have been completed without the assistance of graduate students from three different institutions. Much of the analysis of needed change in subject headings and classification can best be handled as an on-going function of the Library of Congress and other authorities charged with maintenance of classification and subject heading schemes. The SAC also shares responsibility for examining research on needed modifications to the tools of subject analysis and recommending changes.

2. The SAC should pay greater attention to the area of classification and should act more directly and positively as a change-agent in this area. A stronger liaison role should be developed with the classification authorities for both LCC and DCC systems.

3. While the Subcommittee commends all of the recommendations made in the individual reports to SAC, one of the most urgent needs is greater attention to revise the Library of Congress Classification schedules and indexes with regard to the treatment of materials on people and peoples.

This is a major research undertaking which, unless it is to be done piecemeal, may require special funding.

4. A set of principles should be developed to cover classification of materials relating to people and peoples. These principles could mirror those constructed by Joan Marshall for preparation of non-racist/non-sexist subject headings. We recommend that the Subject Analysis Committee develop these principles.

5. The potential of modern computer technology should be exploited to maintain subject terms in conformity with usage warrant. The relative frequency of occurrence of words and phrases can be determined fairly easily; it is even possible to detect trends in terminology. We recommend that the Library of Congress undertake greater exploitation of computer Technology to research terminology usage patterns.

6. The Subcommittee wishes specifically to commend the use by the Library of Congress research done by Joan Marshall and Doris Clack in the areas of subject analysis for women - and minority - related materials. These works should be used as guides in making subject heading and classification changes.

SUMMARY OF ALL SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Subcommittee has discussed prioritization of its recommendations. We realize that where several recommendations affect the work of a particular individual or group at the Library of Congress guidelines on priority are helpful. The order listed in the summary of the Milstead/Clack paper should serve as a suggested ranking. Structural changes will have the greatest over-all impact on subject headings and thus of first importance. In terms of changes related to specific groups, the recommendations for senior citizen heading changes are perhaps more immediately double and thus are recommended ahead of others. LC subject headings are more widely used than LC classification, and thus takes some precedence. Updating of the H schedule, however, should be placed high on the LC agenda.

Very high priority should be given to needed DDC classification changes as described in the report.

In summary, therefore, the Racism and Sexism in Subject Analysis Ad Hoc Subcommittee recommend:

For Subject Analysis Committee:

1. Endorsement of the Subcommittee's report and forwarding to the appropriate bodies.
2. Greater liaison work and analysis by SAC in areas of LC and DDC classification.
3. SAC should develop a set of principles to cover classification of materials relating to people and peoples.
4. Further work by SAC to contact REFORMA and representative Mexican American Organizations to determine whether change is needed in the subject heading usage for this ethnic group.
5. Continue the effort to find appropriate terminology to describe traditional concerns and customs. The Subcommittee does not find the term PRIMITIVE acceptable, at least with regard to Indian customs and activities.

For Library of Congress:

Subject headings:

1. Analyze the list of subject headings for improved structural consistency through greater synthesis of complex topics, additional scope notes, and redistribution of subdivisions so as to avoid negative connotations.
2. Abandonment of objectification
3. Changes to AGED/OLD AGE/AGING sequence.
4. Changes concerning names of Indian groups and subheads applied to them.
5. Removal of subheads with negative connotations.

LC classification

1. Update H schedule
2. Change treatment of peoples in E-F
3. Make changes recommended for U Schedule and use the study To make similar kinds of changes in other portions of the schedule.

LC in general

1. Greater use of computer technology in analyzing needed subject heading changes.
2. Greater attention toward revision of LC Classification schedules and indexes in general to remove bias regarding people and peoples.

Dewey Decimal Editorial Policy Committee

1. Use of recommended changes to 305/306 for creation of an alternative schedule.
2. Break up indiscriminate groupings of women, slaves, and ethnic groups.

NOTES

[1] "RTSD Manual of Procedures : Cataloging and Classification Section committees -- 1979-80, Subject Analysis Committee, Subcommittee on Racism and Sexism in Subject Analysis," (October 1979), p. R10.

[2] Joan K. Marshall, On Equal Terms : A Thesaurus for Nonsexist Indexing and Cataloging (New York : Neal-Schuman, 1977), p. 6-10.

[3] Jessica L. Milstead Harris and Doris H. Clack, "Treatment of People and Peoples in Subject Analysis, "Library Resources and Technical Services 23:374-390 (Fall 1979).

Appendix 1

LITERARY WARRANT: A STUDY USING THE LIBCON DATA BASE

Jessica L. Harris
St. John's University
Division of Library and Information Science

Introduction

This brief report is prepared for the use of the members of the ALA-SAC Ad hoc Subcommittee on Racism and Sexism in Subject Analysis. It attempts to shed some light on the extent to which literary warrant justifies, or fails to justify, selection of preferred terms for reference to certain specific groups of people.

The LIBCON/E data base, which contains MARC records, was searched for this study by the members of a class in Machine-Readable Data Bases. Each group was studied by one or more students, depending on the number of references or the number of terms which had to be considered. In general, the methodology used was to determine the subject heading(s) used for material about the group. The word(s) in the subject heading were searched in LIBCON, using AND logic. Then, by one means or another the titles of all books with the subject heading(s) published in the target years were searched for the word or phrase being considered. The set was normally partitioned by year of publication in order to minimize the amount of stringsearching required. This operation is extremely time-consuming in ORBIT, but is the only way to locate a specific phrase in a title. Titles from 1969 and 1977 were used as a sample so that changes over time could be noted.

In some cases the student stringsearched directly on the titles of books which met the criterion of containing the subject heading words; in other cases the student first pulled out from the subject heading set all items which contained the words of the target phrase, and stringsearched those. The final result is the same; stringsearching a larger number of titles just takes longer.

Deviations from this general methodology are noted as they occur. The presentation is primarily tabular in format, with narrative discussion used only where clarification is needed. The headings in the narrative discussion show the subject headings which were searched.

Table 1 shows, for each group, the total postings to the Subject Heading(s) for each year studied, the title words or phrases searched, the number of uses of each in the two years, and the percentages these form of the total. Peculiarities of specific searches are noted in the table or in the discussion below. The heading shows the term(s) on which the search is based. The colon (:) is the general truncation symbol in ORBIT, while the hash mark (#) matches any single character. False drops have been eliminated from the totals.

TABLE 1. Use of words and phrases for special groups in 1969 and 1977.

Appendix 1

1969 Title word(s)	Total postings to subject heading(s)	Titles containing word(s)	%	1977 Title word(s)	Total postings to subject heading(s)	Titles containing word(s)	%
ay #	10	0	0	Gay #	73	19	26%
omosexual:		4	40%	Homosexual:		32	44%
ndicap:	218	28	13%	Handicap:	325	60	18%
isabl:or Disabil:		19	9%	Disabl: or Disabl:		39	12%
	(1970 searched)						
tive #American:	349	2	0.6%	Native#American:	752	14	2%
erican Indian#		29	8%	American Indian#		52	7%
enior:citizen#		0	0	Senior:citizen#		5	2%
ing		16	20%	Aging		99	35%
ed		1	1%	Aged	280	16	6%
derly	79	5	6%	Elderly		45	16%
d:		11	14%	Old:		38	14%
outh		112	42%	Youth		95	26%
ung People	264	16	6%	Young people	367	24	7%
ung#adults		2	1%	Young#adults		3	1%
ung women/ . Young men		2	1%	Young women/ OR Young men		2	0.5%
en(s), enage(r)(rs)		18	7%	Teen(s) Teenage(r)(rs)		11	3%
olescen(t)(ts) (ce)		30	11%	Adolescen(t)(ts) (ce)		70	19%
xican(-) merican(s)		14	50%	Mexican(-) American(s)		11	21%
icano(s)	28	0	0	Chicano(s)	52	20	38%

Homosexual:

The tabular information is self-explanatory, but 1978 showed a continuation of the increase in use of "gay:". Of 48 items, 18 contained this word, while 15 contained "homosexual:".

Handicapped

Forms of "handicap" predominate over forms of "disabled" and "disability" in both 1969 and 1977.

America and Indian#

This search was defective, but in a way that does not bias the results. "Indian #" alone was not stringsearched, only "American Indian #". If the single word had been searched, "Indian" would most likely have dominated "Native # American#" even more. The proportion of use of the latter term tripled between 1970 and 1979, but it still was used in only 2% of titles, and less than a third as often as "American Indian#".

Aging or Aged or (Old and Age)

No clear trend can be seen here. "Senior citizen" is new and as yet little used. While "aging" appears to dominate, many of the titles containing this word are reports produced by the President's Commission on the Aging and other such bodies. These would tend to use the terminology of their charge, introducing a source of bias. Reminder: false drops, e.g., "aging of fruit," were deleted from these totals.

Youth

Literary warrant appears to exist for "Youth," though use of the term is decreasing, while forms of adolescent are increasing.

Mexican Americans

A dramatic change is evident here, from no use of "Chicano" in 1969 to use in 38% of the titles samples in 1977. At the same time, use of "Mexican American" has decreased from 50% to 21%.

Conclusion

The results of this small study are variable; in some cases the LC Subject term appears to be justified by literary warrant, in others not. Terminology is plainly changing in many cases, and thus any recommendations for change must take this instability into account.

No statistical manipulations were performed on these data.

Acknowledgements

The cooperation of the following class participants in acquisition and analysis of the data is gratefully acknowledged:

Susan Chen
John Conway
Anne M. Donnellan
Lauren Fleischman
Dorothy Harrington
Gloria Kelman
Eva Montoute
Szilvia Szmuk
Sujatha Thomas

APPENDIX 2

A REVIEW OF SUBJECT ACCESS TO AMERICAN INDIAN MATERIALS

I am not an expert on Indian literature, customs, culture, or history. In this critique of LCSH access to materials by or about American Indians, I have, first, attempted to verify Indian acceptance of some used terms. Second, I reviewed the subdivision and reference structure used under INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA in three ways. (My comments on that structure apply to the structure used under INDIANS, INDIANS OF CENTRAL AMERICA, etc.) Were the subdivisions and references specific, were they non-prejudicial, and were they unambiguous?

Group Self-Identification

The "Principles for Establishing Subject Headings Relating to People or Peoples" which have been accepted for use by LC require group self-identification if this is at all possible. The names of many Indian peoples, as established in the LCSH, are names given them by early European settlers. These names should be reviewed by experts who are qualified to determine, and report to LC, which names are authentic. The peoples who have come to be known by non-authentic names, such as the Nez Percé, should be consulted as to preferred form. It is possible that some of these groups prefer the non-authentic name to which they themselves may have become accustomed. It is also possible that an authentic form is preferred; if so, this form should be established, even if it is unfamiliar to non-Indian users (and makers) of our catalogs. Eskimo, for example, has been identified as a non-authentic and non-preferred name; Inuit should be established. (Canadian Subject Headings (1979) uses INUIT with see references from ESKIMAUAN INDIANS, ESKIMOS, ESQUIMAUX, and INNUIT.)

American Indians should be consulted also about the LCSH use of Indian personal names such as SITTING BULL, DAKOTA CHIEF, 1831-1890 and CRAZY HORSE, OGLALA INDIAN, 1842 (ca.)-1877. Again, the use of Sitting Bull, rather than Tatanka Iotanka (an Indian form I found recorded in the CIBC publication Stereotypes, Distortions and Omissions in U. S. History Textbooks, 1977), may have gained acceptance, through usage, with Indian peoples, but its use should be sanctioned by Indians if we are adhering to the "Principles."

My attempt to obtain direct information from American Indian organizations about a preference for a general self-identifying term was not successful. However, in the names of 59 American Indian groups the terms "American Indian" or "Indian" appears 37 times; the terms "Native American" or "Native" only appears three times; the term "Amerindian" does not appear. In a catalog of 20 publications available from the Indian Historian Press, the term "Indian" was used in 12 titles; "Native American" and "Amerindian" did not appear. Both group usage and literary warrant apparently sanction the use of INDIANS as a subject entry term.

The use of INDIANS OF..., however, rather than American, Canadian, Mexican, etc. Indians raises questions about group self-identification and about LCSH clarity, specificity, and bias. The INDIANS OF... form was probably established in an effort to collocate general works on Indians. But the form

is a circumlocution that does not correspond to the used language of either Indians or non-Indians. The INDIANS OF... form also implies, rather subtly, that the Indians are "of" but not an integral part of contemporary society; it also erroneously implies that Indian matters are above governmental jurisdiction. (This is particularly true of the use of INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA to mean INDIANS OF THE UNITED STATES; this misuse is discussed below under reference structure.)

If collocation is desirable (which I concede), it could be achieved by use of the entry terms: Indians; Indians, American; Indians, Canadian; Indians, Mexican; Indians, North American; etc. Although the use of an inverted form does weaken the correspondence between the term and used language, these forms would, at least, unambiguously acknowledge that Indians are contemporary and that they are jurisdictionally, as well as geographically, limited. (There was some disagreement on the Subcommittee about the use of the term "American" to identify Indians of the United States. The use of the term to mean a citizen of the United States is, without doubt, a misappropriation, but it is an historical misappropriation. It is now firmly fixed in the language of Americans and non-Americans both--"Americans go home," "ugly Americans," and "American imperialism" are clearly understood to mean United States citizens and government everywhere in the world. There is precedent for the use of "American" to mean United States in LCSH terms such as AMERICAN ART, DRAMA, LITERATURE, POETRY, etc.)

The use of the word "tribe" as a descriptive gloss under names of peoples was criticized by Berman in Prejudices and Antipathies (p. 110-111). The word is not used as a gloss in the LCSH under INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA. The word is used in the subdivisions TRIBAL CITIZENSHIP and TRIBAL GOVERNMENT. In the names of 59 American Indian groups referred to earlier, the words "tribe" or "tribal" appears 15 times; a substitute term does not appear. Group use appears to sanction LCSH use where appropriate--as in the subdivisions above.

Subdivision and Reference Structure

My examination of the subdivision and reference structure used under INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA revealed some very complex problems. (The LCSH 8th edition and Supplements through 1977 were examined.)

Specificity

The use of a see reference from INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA--ETHNOLOGY to the basic term assumes that all works on North American Indians are ethnological. This is a ridiculous and offensive equation. Works on Indian citizenship, economic conditions, education, social conditions, etc. are clearly not ethnological studies. The equation blurs the distinction that should be made between works on traditional Indian customs, rites, tribal organization, etc. and works on contemporary Indian peoples and concerns. Further, the equation, in effect, denies that there are contemporary Indian concerns; if everything written about a group of people is of interest only to ethnologists, the group is almost surely not part of contemporary society.

The LCSH assumption that all works on North American Indians are of historical or scientific, rather than contemporary, interest is confirmed in the 1974-76 LCSH Supplement. In that Supplement a number of subdivision changes are recorded. Although I am certain that LC made the changes in an attempt at amelioration, their attempt was not very successful. INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA, CIVILIZATION OF and its scope note, "Here is entered literature dealing with efforts to civilize the Indians...", were canceled and the subdivision CULTURAL ASSIMILATION (with a see reference from INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA, CIVILIZATION OF) was established.

"Cultural assimilation" certainly provides a less biased approach to materials on Indian-settler relations, but its establishment bounced, for some reason inconceivable to me, the previously established subdivision CULTURE. INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA--CULTURE became a see reference to the basic term. This creates two problems. First, the reference assumes, as with the reference from ETHNOLOGY, that works on Indian citizenship, economic conditions, education, social conditions, etc. are works on Indian culture. The assumption, again, is ridiculous and offensive.

Second, the terms "culture" and"cultural assimilation" do not describe the same phenomenon. "Culture" signifies the customs, ideas, and attitudes shared by a group of people and transmitted from generation to generation. "Cultural assimilation" describes the process of modification in a culture through contact with another culture. Berman noted in Prejudices and Antipathies that there was a see reference from INDIANS OF...--CIVILIZATION to INDIANS OF...--CULTURE. His comment, relevant then, is even more relevant now that the subdivision CULTURE has been cancelled:

> In other words, the scheme generously acknowledges that the Mayas, Inca, Toltecs, and others--like all "primitives"--possessed a "culture," but refuses to grant that some, at least, had created "civilizations." The remedy for this absurdity is to replace --CULTURE with a new form, --CIVILIZATION AND CULTURE, which should satisfactorily embrace buffalo-hunters and pyramid-builders alike (p. 77).

In addition to failing to distinguish between works on traditional and works on contemporary matters, the LCSH fails to distinguish adequately between works on or by American and Canadian Indians. There is a see reference from INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA--UNITED STATES to the basic heading. There is not a parallel reference from INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA--CANADA since LC has found it necessary, in some instances, to distinguish between works on American and works on Canadian Indians.

The equation of INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA with Indians of the United States has created very confused access to both general materials and to materials specifically on either Canadian or

American Indians. The scope note under the basic term reads:

> Subdivided by states, provinces, regions, etc., e.g. Indians of North America--Massachusetts; Indians of North America--British Columbia; Indians of North America--Mississippi Valley.

The note does not add that the basic term is also subdivided by one of the two constituent countries of North America. Massachusetts and British Columbia are comparable political entities. North America (used as both a geographic term and as a substitute for the United States) and Canada are not comparable political entities.

This is a clear example of LCSH use of subsuming terminology, and as with all uses of such terminology, access to materials is impeded through the loss specificity. Works on North American Indians in general, and works on American Indians specifically, are entered under the same term. Works on Canadian Indians are entered specifically although a user has no reason to suspect this from the scope note quoted above.

The use of Canada as a subdivision under INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA is specifically stated (between CALIFORNIA and INDIAN TERRITORY) in the LCSH:

> Indians of North America--Canada
> x Indians of Canada
> --Government relations
> xx Indians of North America--Government Relations

LC also uses subdivisions of general application, such as ANTIQUITIES; ART; ECONOMIC CONDITIONS; EDUCATION; LEGAL STATUS, LAWS, ETC.; LEGENDS; etc., under INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA--CANADA. This raises a number of problems. First, there are no see also references made from the subdivisions of general application. A user looking under INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA--GOVERNMENT RELATIONS will be directed by a see also to materials entered under INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA--CANADA--GOVERNMENT RELATIONS. There are no see also references from INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA--ANTIQUITIES, ART, ECONOMIC CONDITIONS, etc. to similar material entered under INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA--CANADA--ANTIQUITIES, ART, ECONOMIC CONDITIONS, etc.

Second, these subdivisions fall into two distinct groups; each with it own distinct problem. Works on topics such as economic conditions, education, and legal status are similar to works on government relations in that they are usually jurisdictionally limited by city, state, province, region, or country; rarely by continent. Since this is so, works on the legal status of American Indians, for instance, are accessible under a single heading, although the heading is totally inaccurate: INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA--LEGAL STATUS, LAWS, ETC. Works on the legal status of Canadian Indians also are accessible under a single heading: INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA--CANADA--LEGAL STATUS, LAWS, ETC., although the two headings are not linked. This benefit to the user is not the result of careful LCSH planning but of accident. As far as I

could ascertain, there have been no comparative works on the legal status of the American and the Canadian Indian. If there are such works, they are buried under the mass of works on the status of the American Indian entered under INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA--LEGAL STATUS, LAWS, ETC.

The happy accident of authors' self-imposition of a jurisdictional limitation upon their considerations of a topic does not, however, pertain to works entered under subdivisions such as ANTIQUITIES, ART, LEGENDS, etc. Consequently, works on both North American and American (i.e. United States) Indian antiquities, art, legends, etc. are entered under INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA with appropriate subdivision. A work is entered under INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA--CANADA only if it has a specifically stated Canadian geographic focus. In the 1970-74 LC Books: Subjects cumulation, for example, the number of titles under LEGENDS that have a North American focus and that have an American focus are about equally divided; these works are all entered under the same heading: INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA--LEGENDS. In the same cumulation, there are two entries under INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA--CANADA--LEGENDS. See also references do not link the two headings.

The structure serves no one. The user interested in legends of North American Indians is going to miss those entered under INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA--CANADA. (Remember that the scope note under the basic term would lead one to believe that Canada was not used as a subdivision.) The user interested in Canadian Indian legends will not be directed from the specific to the broader term; if this user does find the broader term, he or she will have to distinguish between general works and works on American Indian legend. The user who wants American Indian legends only has to distinguish these works from works on North American Indian legend.

The non-precision of the LCSH use of INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA is likely to lead users astray; apparently it also leads LC catalogers astray. In the 1970-74 LC Books: Subjects cumulation, a collection of Indian legends from Labrador, compiled by the University of Montreal, is entered under INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA--LEGENDS. In the same cumulation, there are three entries under INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA--CANADA--ART. The title of one entry is Indian and Eskimo Art of Canada; under INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA--ART, in the same volume, the title Art of the Canadian Indians and Eskimos is entered.

The American-Canadian Indian LCSH access is further confused by the see reference structure. There are references to INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA from AMERICAN ABORIGINES, AMERICAN INDIANS, INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA--UNITED STATES (as noted earlier), INDIANS OF THE UNITED STATES, and NORTH AMERICAN INDIANS. Under INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA--CANADA, there is one see reference: INDIANS OF CANADA. Canadian Indians, the natural language access point, is not used even as a see reference.

Specific access to materials is impeded also by LC's duplicate entry policy on works with both a form or topical and a geographic or tribal focus. This policy is specifically stated, in a few

places, in the LCSH. Under the subdivision PORTRAITS, for example, there is the scope note:

> This heading covers general collections of portraits of Indians and also works containing portraits of Indians of a particular tribe or of the tribes of a specific locality. The latter are entered also under the name of the tribe or under the local subdivision, e.g. a work which deals with portraits of Indians of Oregon will appear under: 1. Indians of North America--Portraits. 2. Indians of North America--Oregon.

Neither of the headings described in the scope note is specific. This policy is also applied to works of topical interest. For example, in the 1970-74 LC: Books: Subjects cumulation, a work on alcholism among British Columbian Indians is entered under INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA--LIQUOR PROBLEM and INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA--BRITISH COLUMBIA.

The user interested specifically in portraits of Oregon Indians or Apache Indians, or in works on alcholism among British Columbian Indians, is forced to do a crude boolean search through the tracings. Duplicate entry has obvious benefits in smaller collections since it provides multiple access to single items. In larger collections, however, duplicate non-specific entry simply swells the file. The benefits of duplicate entry in any size collection would be enhanced if each entry were specific (as they are in UNITED STATES--FOREIGN RELATIONS--FRANCE and FRANCE--FOREIGN RELATIONS--UNITED STATES). For example: INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA--LIQUOR PROBLEM--BRITISH COLUMBIA and INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA--BRITISH COLUMBIA--LIQUOR PROBLEM.

Bias

The LCSH equation of works on North American Indians with ethnological works may account for the many see also from references under subdivisions to headings of the form: [NOUN], PRIMITIVE. For example:

> Indians of North America--Agriculture
> xx Agriculture, Primitive
>
> Indians of North America--Fishing
> xx Fishing, Primitive

The reference structure presumes that works entered under these subdivisions are on traditional forms of Indian agriculture and fishing. In the 1970-74 LC Books: Subjects cumulation, however, a work by the Navajo Indian Irrigation Project Planning Team (1972) is entered under AGRICULTURE, and a work titled Uncommon Controversy: Fishing Rights of the Muckleshoot, Puyallup, and Nisqually Indians (1970) is entered under FISHING. These are not works on traditional forms of Indian agriculture and fishing.

Specific subject access to materials on Indian affairs and concerns will be achieved only if a clear distinction is made

between works on contemporary issues and works on tradition. The headings used for works on tradition should be modified to accurately reflect that aspect of the work. The subdivision COSTUME AND ADORNMENT, for example, implies that works entered under it are concerned with traditional Indian dress. Implications, however, are not specific. All such subdivisions should be modified; for example: AGRICULTURE, TRADITIONAL; COSTUME AND ADORNMENT, TRADITIONAL; COMMERCE, TRADITIONAL; DWELLINGS, TRADITIONAL; FISHING, TRADITIONAL; etc.

The see also from references (e.g. xx Agriculture, /Traditional/) should be made under the modified form only. See references that relate to tradition also should be made under the modified form only. For example, the reference from TRADING POSTS should be made to COMMERCE, TRADITIONAL; the references from TEEPEES, TEPEES, TIPIS, and WIGWAMS should be made to DWELLINGS, TRADITIONAL. (The see reference structure should also be examined for completeness. If we are to have references from three different spellings of "teepee," we probably should have references from "long houses," "hogans," and other names for traditional Indian dwellings. If we are to have a reference from "birch-bark canoes," to BOATS, there should be references from other forms of Indian water transport.)

The offensiveness of the word "primitive" as a descriptor for works on the traditional customs, organization, rites, etc. of non-European peoples was amply documented by Berman in Prejudices and Antipathies (p. 99-102). He recommends the use of "traditional." LC is using "traditional" in new headings; in the LCSH Supplement (1974-76), for example:

Indians of North America--Painting
Here are entered works on American Indian painting in traditional forms and utilizing traditional materials. Works on painting by American Indian artists who have turned to non-traditional forms and materials under the influence of Western art are entered under Painting, Indian.
sa Painting, Indian
x American Indian painting, Traditional
Indian painting, Traditional
xx Indians--Art
Painting, Indian

The use of the word "traditional" in both the scope note and in the see references is a great improvement. The scope note, however, could be considerably shorter if the heading were specific: INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA--PAINTING, TRADITIONAL. (Painting, Indian is in accord with an LCSH pattern.)

The use of the subdivision LIQUOR PROBLEM raises a number of questions. First, it suggests that Indians have a special problem with alcohol thus reinforcing the popular belief (which is constantly reinforced quite adequately by popular culture media) that Indians, unlike Europeans, cannot take even one alcoholic drink without erupting into savagery or sinking irretrievably into alcoholism. Second, the subdivision does not fit the LCSH pattern for works on alcoholism; the pattern is ALCOHOL AND JEWS, WOMEN, etc. Third, neither the subdivision nor the LCSH pattern provide immediate and unambiguous access to works on a topic of serious concern.

Who has the liquor "problem?" The LCSH scope note under ALCOHOLISM refers the user to LIQUOR PROBLEM--as a primary term--for "works of an administrative or local character." The note does not clarify the use of "liquor problem" as a subdivision. In the 1970-74 LC Books: Subjects cumulation, the titles entered under INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA--LIQUOR PROBLEM are Problems with Alcoholism Among Urban Indians in Minneapolis (1970); Suicide, Homocide, and Alcoholism Among American Indians (1973); A Study of Alcohol Consumption among Saskatchewan Indians (1972). None of these works is of an"administrative character;" two of them are local studies.

What does the LCSH pattern ALCOHOL AND... mean? In the LCSH "and" is used usually to link two nouns which represent non-separable aspects of a topic; for example, HEALTH AND HYGIENE, POLITICS AND GOVERNMENT, RULES AND PRACTICE, DESCRIPTION AND TRAVEL, HISTORY AND CRITICISM, etc. ALCOHOL AND... was probably meant to be a euphemism, but, as with most euphemisms, it is imprecise and impedes access.

Alcoholism is a very serious problem (among many and varied classes of persons) that is being seriously researched; access to that research is a cataloging responsibility. The present LCSH structure does not even provide a cross reference from INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA--ALCOHOLISM or ALCOHOL AND INDIANS (the LCSH pattern) to INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA--LIQUOR PROBLEM. How is the interested user supposed to find the three works cited above?

Precise headings should be established. If collocation by condition is most desirable, the headings should be "Alcoholic Indians (United States)," "... (Canada, etc.), "Alcoholic women," etc. with appropriate references under American, Canadian, and other Indians, and with appropriate references under women and other classes of persons. If collocation by race, sex, class, or ethnicity is most desirable, the subdivision "alcoholism" should be established, and used uniformly, with appropriate references.

Indian history, judging by the LCSH chronological subdivision structure, begins with the COLONIAL PERIOD, ca. 1600-1775 and ceases with the CIVIL WAR, 1861-1865. Is there no Indian history between 1775 and 1861? The see also structure leads the user to INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA--WARS for a full, if biased, list of access points for works on American Indian history. This

raises a number of questions.

First, access to materials on wars is provided elsewhere in the LCSH under the subdivision HISTORY; e.g. UNITED STATES--HISTORY--KING GEORGE'S WAR, 1744-1748; UNITED STATES--HISTORY--WAR OF 1812; etc. Direct entry under WARS places undue emphasis on this aspect of Indian history. Admittedly, since most Indian histories, until recently, have been written by non-Indians, the historical emphasis may have been on Indian-European/American conflict, but this does not warrant the use of a different subdivision practice. European/American history is also a history of war.

Second, the subdivision WARS, whether used as an indirect or a direct subdivision, should specify the warring parties. Who were the Chickasaw Indians fighting from 1739-1740? Who were the Tuscaroras fighting from 1711-1713? Headings such as EASTERN INDIANS, WARS WITH, 1722-1726 and PACIFIC COAST INDIANS, WARS WITH, 1847-1865 certainly raise the question of with whom? Implicitly, of course, it is with the United States, but since Indians did, on occasion, war against each other, the subdivision should be explicit; INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA--WARS WITH THE UNITED STATES; TUSCARORA INDIANS--WARS WITH THE UNITED STATES, 1711-1713; PACIFIC COAST INDIANS--WARS WITH THE UNITED STATES, 1847-1865; etc.

Third, the headings INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA--HISTORY and --WARS, with their subdivisions and references, clearly refer to the history of American Indians specifically and not to North American Indians in general. The chronological subdivisions listed under HISTORY coincide with American history chronology; the see also structure under WARS refer to Indian-United States encounters.

Fourth, the word "massacre" continues to be used to describe many encounters between Indians and European/American settlers. This word is not used consistently, from one reference source to another, to describe an encounter between two groups of peoples. The New Columbia Encyclopedia (1975) refers to the 1864 incident at Sand Creek as a massacre; the LCSH refers to it as a battle. The same encyclopedia refers to the Indian encounter with Fetterman's forces in 1866 as a massacre; the LCSH refers to it as the FETTERMAN FIGHT, 1866. The term "massacre" usually represents the point of view of the person writing history rather than objective fact. The term should not be used in a list of subject access terms. If a particular historical incident has become so firmly fixed in popular imagination as a "massacre" that works on that incident would be lost if entered otherwise, the word should be used in quotation marks; e.g. Boston "Massacre."

Finally, to subsume all of the Indian-settler encounters under the term INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA--WARS is to categorize all those encounters as formal hostile actions in the European tradition. How many formal declarations of war against the United States were made by Indian peoples? More importantly, how many formal declarations of war against a particular Indian people were made by the United States?

INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA--WARS, as an LCSH entry term, subtly places the onus for Indian-settler/United States hostility on the Indians. This is historically inaccurate. Treaties were broken by US (settlers and the United States government), not by the Indians.

Ambiguity

More scope notes are needed under LCSH subdivisions. The use of APPROPRIATIONS, for example, is not clear until one examines materials entered under that term. It could just as easily be interpreted to mean lands, rights, etc. that the Indians have "appropriated;" for example, works on the occupation of Alcatraz. The present see references (APPROPRIATIONS, INDIAN; INDIAN APPROPRIATIONS) do nothing to clarify the use of the subdivision. A scope note is needed if the term is to be retained. The establishment of a new, specific entry term is desirable; Federal appropriations (or State, City, as applicable) would be clearer--Federal reparations programs would be most accurate.

The subdivision CAPTIVITIES also needs a scope note. Again, examination of the material reveals that works on settlers held captive by the Indians are entered under the subdivision. Where are works on Indians held captive by the settlers and the United States Government entered? Historically, both situations existed. Works on Indian "captivities," as far as I can ascertain, are entered under such neutral subdivisions as HISTORY, LAND TRANSFERS, GOVERNMENT RELATIONS, AND TREATIES. (If euphemisms such as LAND TRANSFERS are to be used without explanation, then perhaps we should substitute "Settler-Indian relations" for CAPTIVITIES.) "Captivities" has literary warrant, but it needs a scope note which defines the type of material entered and refers the user to materials on the reverse situation.

The euphemistic LAND TRANSFERS needs both a scope note and an expanded see reference structure. Land "transfers" were actually forced removals of Indians from their lands or an agreement by the Indians for the "sale" of land based upon a misconception of what the settlers "sale" and "buy" meant. The scope note might read: "Here are entered works on the forced removal of Indians from their land by the United States Government, and works on the transfer of of land which were based on an Indian misunderstanding of the terms "sale" or "buy." References are needed from "Forced removal," "Land sales," and "Captivities."

The subdivision CLAIMS is used unambiguously--CLAIMS (AGAINST THE INDIANS)--and ambiguously--CLAIMS; the unglossed form should be made explicit: CLAIMS (BY THE INDIANS). The unglossed subdivision MISSIONS is ambiguous. The subdivision structure (see also JESUITS--MISSIONS) and an examination of the materials entered under the subdivision implies that the subdivision is applied to works on Christian missionaries' work with Indian peoples. The explicit form of entry would be: MISSIONS (CHRISTIAN) TO THE INDIANS.

The subdivision GIFTS needs a scope note. The see also references to both INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA--GOVERNMENT RELATIONS and --SOCIAL LIFE AND CUSTOMS leave the user (and the librarian attempting to intercede) at a loss in interpreting the use of the subdivision.

Are works on the sale of Manhattan Island (GOVERNMENT RELATIONS) and works on the appropriate wedding, anniversary, etc. gift (SOCIAL LIFE AND CUSTOMS) to be found under INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA--GIFTS? A search of LC Books: Subjects from its inception in 1950 through the April-June 1979 cumulation proved to be of no assistance in explicating the application of the term. INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA--GIFTS has been assigned to one work only since 1950: Wilbur R. Jacobs' Diplomacy and Indian Gifts; Anglo-French Rivalry along the Ohio and Northwest Frontiers, 1748-1763. 1950. I could not locate a copy of Jacobs' work so I cannot say with certainty what it is about; the title infers, however, that the gifts were made to the Indians. If this is so, the subdivision should be explicit. Since the subdivision has only been assigned to one title in almost thirty years, however, perhaps it is not needed.

I find the subdivision MIXED BLOODS offensive; Berman also found it offensive and an example of "shoddy science" (Prejudices and Antipathies, p. 40-41). Berman suggested that American Indian organizations be consulted for an appropriate substitute term. It has been suggested to me that a canvass of American Indians for substitute terminology is likely to result in suggestions for terms that are far more offensive. This may be true, but LC should attempt such a canvass; if the results are unsatisfactory, the scholarly community should be consulted.

Summary of Recommendations

1. Experts in Indian studies should be asked to identify non-authentic tribal and personal Indian names used in the LCSH. If a non-authentic name is not preferred by the peoples themselves, the authentic form should be established.

2. Consideration should be given to replacing the INDIANS OF... form with American, Canadian, Mexican, etc. Indians or with Indians, American; Indians, Canadian; Indians, Mexican; etc.

3. If the present primary entry point is retained, a clear distinction must be made between works on North American Indians in general and works on American or Canadian Indians specifically. For example: INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA; INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA--UNITED STATES; or INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA; INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA (AMERICAN); INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA (CANADIAN).

The present scope note under INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA needs revision. If UNITED STATES is established as a subdivision, the note should read: 'Subdivided by United States, Canada, and by states, provinces, regions, etc...." Consideration should be given, however, to indirect subdivision of all works that would be assigned a jurisdictional subdivision. For example: INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA--UNITED STATES--MASSACHUSETTS; INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA--CANADA--BRITISH COLUMBIA. Subdivision by region should be made either directly under the basic heading in all instances (i.e. even when the region is wholly in one jurisdiction): INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA--MISSISSIPPI VALLEY and INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA--NORTHWEST COAST OF NORTH AMERICA or made in all instances under the subheading for the jurisdiction with duplicate entry as necessary: INDIANS OF

NORTH AMERICA--CANADA--NORTHWEST COAST OF NORTH AMERICA and INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA--UNITED STATES--NORTHWEST COAST OF NORTH AMERICA.

If the glossed form is adopted, INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA (AMERICAN), INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA (CANADIAN), the question of direct or indirect subdivision becomes moot.

4. Ethnology and Civilization and culture should be established as subdivisions.

5. Duplicate entries established to provide access to materials by both form or topic and geographic or jurisdictional location should be specific in each instance.

6. A distinction should be made between works on contemporary and traditional Indian concerns, customs, etc.

7. Subdivisions which do not conform to LCSH patterns should be dropped; for example: LIQUOR PROBLEM and WARS. (Some LCSH patterns should be reexamined before they are expanded to cover materials on Indians; for example ALCOHOL AND... .)

8. Establish more scope notes defining the materials entered under a subdivision.

Appendix 3

RTSD/CCS Subject Analysis Committee
Subcommittee on Racism and Sexism
In Subject Analysis

DEWEY DECIMAL CLASSIFICATION, EDITION 19: SCHEDULES RELATING TO MEN, WOMEN, AGE LEVELS, AND ALTERNATIVE RELATIONSHIPS

Submitted by Elizabeth M. Dickinson

The 301 to 309 section of Dewey Decimal Classification, edition 19, was examined to determine changes in the classification structure and heading terminology compared to the previous editions. The analysis presented in this report is limited to sections dealing with age levels, men and women, sexual/affectional and lifestyle preferences.

The new structure takes what had been crowded into 301 and spreads it throughout the 302 through 307 range. To eliminate overlap of material use of 301 is virtually abandoned. The segment under study here has been moved from 301.4 Social Structure to 305 Social Stratification (Social Structure). The change, presumably, was to allow for more detail within each category necessitated by the increase in the variety and quantity of material now being published on social conditions and structure. The revised schedule also presumably was designed to avoid creation of longer numbers despite provision for additional specificity. Another goal appears to have been updating of spelling and terminology used in captions and elimination of pejorative terms.

The new "phoenix" schedule is not entirely successful, and thus a somewhat modified version of DDC 19 305/306 is proposed. The changes recommended here have been reviewed and approved by the Racism and Sexism in Subject Analysis Subcommittee.

To assist in the analysis the affected segments of DDC 19 have been reproduced. Recommended alterations have been typed in. A comparative chart which details Dewey 18 against Dewey 19 and makes recommended changes, is also attached. The major points of variation between old, new and alternative schedules are outlined in the comparative chart.

Appendix 3 (Continued)

The revisions parallel in many respects those adopted under 301.411/301.412 by the Hennepin County Library in 1975. This excellent alternative schedule is described in HCL Cataloging Bulletin 11/12/13 (March 15, 1975), pp. 13-18 and in Unabashed Librarian 14 (Winter 1975), pp. 25-26.

ANALYSIS

DDC 19 exhibits two major flaws in the treatment of relationships between the sexes. The first problem relates to the elimination of a general number for comprehensive works on the sexes. The second relates to the placement and treatment of sexual/affectional and lifestyle preferences in DDC 19.

The new schedule fails to maintain the hierarchical pattern of its predecessor and thus combines comprehensive works on "specific sexes" and works relating only to men into one number, 305.3. Dewey 19 displays a transference of the MAN/WOMAN generic problem that is still apparent in LCSH where MAN is presumed to be the all-encompassing term. The proposed modifications restore the hierarchy by placing comprehensive works in 305.3 and separating Men and Women into 305.33 and 305.34 respectively (abandoning use of 305.3 for Men and 305.4 for Women).

Additionally, for larger collections of materials on men and women it is recommended that more specificity be added to the schedules by separating materials into more categories than are detailed in Dewey 19. Those outlined in the comparative chart should all have literary warrant within larger collections, and still have the advantage of specifying relatively short numbers. They include parallel categories for men and women wherever literary warrant merits: gender role (305.331 for men; 305.341 for women); social role and status (305.332 for men; 305.342 for women); specific groups (305.338 for men; 305.348 for women).

It is curious that Dewey 19 chooses to create 305.43 "Occupations -- Including housework, economic role of women" while maintaining at the same time a home for working women in 331.4. At the very least a note defining the use of 305.43 as opposed to 331.4 should be added to the schedule. The Subcommittee concluded, however, that abandonment of the 305.43 slot would be preferable. Adequate coverage of this topic is provided in 331.4.

Appendix 3 (Continued)

The other primary flaw within this segment of the new Dewey schedules relates to the placement, specificity, and terminology used to describe alternative sexual/affectional roles and life styles. DDC 19 separates information relating to the social role and function of men and women from alternative roles and relationships by placing the latter in 306.7 "Institutions pertaining to relations of the sexes." The 306 section is used for "Culture and institutions," and is the schedule used for social and cultural anthropology. Under 306.7 works on "courtship, premarital relations, unwed parenthood, incest, sadism, masochism, bestiality" are all lumped together. Specific sequences are allowed for Extramarital relations (306.73), Prostitution (306.74), and Homosexuality (306.76).

While prostitution might be viewed as an institution, it is more difficult to understand the placement of homosexuality, unwed parenthood, incest, sadism, or other categories included under 306.7. Most of the materials in this section bear more kinship to those classed under the 305.3-305.4 sequence of DDC 19, that is, materials covering the social role and function of men and women. To so widely separate this material from other materials on the sexes and their relations does a disservice.

Recommended, instead, is an extension of 305.3 for other sexual/affectional relationships and roles. As outlined in the comparative chart, the general number 305.35 could be used for courtship, premarital relations, unwed parenthood. Extramarital relations is designated 305.353; Prostitution 305.354. An expansion of the schedule for materials on Homosexual/Gay Lifestyle (fashioned after Hennepin County Library division of this topic) is recommended based upon the growth of materials in this area. In addition, larger collections might specify separate numbers for Transvestism and Transvestites and Transsexuality.

In an effort, no doubt, to avoid judging the appropriateness of various sexual behavior, DDC 19 lumps such practices as incest with courtship under the general number 305.7. The editors have gone overboard in obscuring differences between these topics, and thus, a separate number for "Other sexual behavior" including sadism, masochism, bestiality, and incest in recommended (305.359).

While no change in the basic schedule is recommended at this time under 306.8 "Marriage and family," its placement so far removed from related material in 305 is unfortunate. A thorough rethinking of the topics included in 306 "Culture and institutions" should take place. Some minor editorial changes under the "Marriage and family" sequence are recommended for now.

The other section examined concerns age levels, which is specified in 301.43 in DDC 18 and 305.2 in the new schedule. DDC 19 drops the distinction between children (through age 12) and adolescents (ages 12 through 20). Larger collections may wish to retain the more specific categories, using 305.234 for Children through age 12 and 305.235 for Adolescents (ages 12 to 20).

Over all, the new edition succeeds in updating terminology and spelling. Little remains of a pejorative nature. For example, captions and notes in the Age level section have been thoroughly revised so that "minors" are now called "Young people," "Mature and middle-aged persons" have been transformed into "Adults" and "Aged persons" are now described as "Adults aged 65 and over." The caption applied in DDC 18 to 301.4157-301.4158 "Abnormal sexual relations" has been removed entirely, as has any mention of "Illigitimacy" under "Premarital relations." The continued use of "Homosexuality" without reference to Gay lifestyle or Lesbianism and Lesbians, however, does not recognize the importance of these terms within the material on this topic, and within the homosexual/lesbian/gay community.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The phoenix 305/306 schedules represent in many respects a backward step for the Dewey Decimal Classification. While considerable progress has been made in LCSH and Sears to improve subject terminology, the same sensitivity to subjects relating to men, women, and alternative lifestyle groups has not been sufficiently demonstrated in the latest rendition of Dewey. In recognition of these short-comings at least two libraries, Stockton-San Joaquin Public Library in California and Westchester Library System in New York, have adopted in substance the alternative schedule proposed here. Hennepin County Library intends to maintain the 301 expansion that it developed in 1975. The Racism and Sexism in Subject Analysis Subcommittee believes that libraries of all

types will be better served by adopting one of these alternative schedules than by maintaining the existing DDC 19 schedule in the 305/306 sequence.

Specifically, the Subcommittee recommends that,

1. The Subject Analysis Committee endorse the alternative 305/306 schedule and forward these recommended changes to the Dewey Decimal Editorial Policy Committee with the request that they be considered for publication by the DDC Editorial Policy Committee as an alternative schedule;
2. The Subject Analysis Committee focus greater attention on needed changes in both Dewey and LC Classification. SAC's role in the area of classification should extend beyond the routine reception of reports from DDC and LC classification representatives. The SAC should encourage committee members and others to submit analyses of the classification schedules and proposed changes for SAC's endorsement. Further, the SAC should explore with the Dewey Editorial Policy Committee and LC a more meaningful role that the Committee can play in the process of recommending and adopting schedule changes. An open, on-going dialogue between the SAC and classification editorial authorities needs to take place, just as has been established in the past several years for subject heading practice.

Appendix 3 (Continued)

Comparative chart: DDC 19
305 and 306 schedules compared to DDC 18
Placement and Suggested Modifications

DDC 18	DDC 19	Proposed usage	
301.4	305	305	Social Structure [Recommended caption]
301.43	305.2	305.2	Age levels
301.431	305.23	305.23	Young people
301.4314	305.23	305.234	Children (through age 12)
301.4315	305.23	305.235	Adolescents (Ages 12 to 20)
301.434	305.24	305.24	Adults
301.435	305.26	305.26	Adults aged 65 and over
301.41	305.3	305.3	Change from "Men" to "The sexes and their relations." Delete heading and note: "305.3-305.4 Specific sexes. Class comprehensive works in 305.3 ..."
301.411	305.3	305.33	Men
301.411	305.3	305.331	Gender role of men
301.411	305.3	305.332	Social role and status of men
301.411	305.3	305.338	Specific groups of men
301.412	305.4	305.34	Women
301.412	305.4	305.341	Gender role of women
301.412	305.42	305.342	Social role and status of women
331.4	305.43		Delete: Occupations. Class in 331.4
301.412	305.48	305.348	Specific groups of women
301.415	306.7	305.35	Other sexual/affectional relationships and roles (Recommended caption) [NOTE: Change 306.7 in DDC 19 to 305.35 and change caption from "Institutions pertaining to relations of the sexes" to "Sexual/affectional relationships and roles"]

Appendix 3 (Continued)

DDC 18	DDC 19	Proposed usage	
301.4153	306.73	305.353	Non-marital relationships (Recommended caption)
301.4154	306.74	305.354	Prostitution
301.4157	306.76	305.356	Homosexual/Gay lifestyles (Recommended caption)
301.4157	306.76	305.3561	Homosexual/Gay men (Recommended caption)
301.4157	306.76	305.3562	Lesbianism and Lesbians (Recommended caption)
301.4157	306.76	305.3563	Gay Liberation Movement (Recommended caption)
301.415	306.7	305.357	Transvestism and transvestites (Recommended caption)
301.415	306.7	305.358	Transsexuality (Recommended caption)
301.4158	306.7	305.359	Other sexual behavior (Recommended caption)

Bracketed [ ] information is being deleted.

305 ~~Social stratification~~ (Social structure)

Social status of, role of, problems of, discrimination against, conflict involving social aggregates

Class here minorities, subcultures of specific aggregates

Unless other instructions are given, class complex subjects with aspects in two or more subdivisions of this schedule in the number coming first in the schedule, e.g., middle class black Roman Catholic boys 305.23 (*not* 305.3, 305.55, 305.6 or 305.8). This instruction supersedes, for the subdivisions of 305 only, the order of precedence given under 301–307

Class specific problems of, welfare services to social aggregates in 362, a specific aspect of discrimination with the subject, e.g., discrimination in housing 363.51

.2 Age levels

.23 Young people

.234 [Through age 20] → Children through age 12

.235 → Adolescents ages 12 to 20

.24 Adults

[Class adults of specific sexes in 305.3–305.4]

For adults aged 65 and over, see 305.26

.26 Adults aged 65 and over

▶ [305.3–305.4 Specific sexes

Class comprehensive works in 305.3, adults aged 65 and over regardless of sex in 305.26]

.3 The sexes and their relations → Class here comprehensive works on sex role, gender identity, and sexism, including androgyny. Class sex psychology in 155.3; sex manuals in 613.96.

.33 Men

[Single, married, divorced, widowed; of various specific racial, ethnic, national, language groups; adherent to specific religions

Works emphasizing the male sex

Do not use for general works on racial, ethnic, national, language, religious groups; class these in 305.6–305.8] → Class here comprehensive and interdisciplinary works on men.

[Class here comprehensive works on specific sexes]

[*For women, see 305.4*]

.331 Gender role of men.

Class psychology of men in 155.632. Including consciousness-raising groups.

.332 Social role and status of men.

Including men's liberation movement.

.338 Specific groups of men.

Single, married, divorced, widowed; of various specific racial, ethnic, national, language groups; adherent to specific religions.

Class homosexual men in 305.3561.

.34

[.4] Women

Class here comprehensive and interdisciplinary works on women.
Class woman suffrage in 324.623, women's education in 376.

.341 Gender role of women.

Class psychology of women in 155.633. Including consciousness-raising groups.

Appendix 3

[.42] .342 Social role and status

Including discrimination, women's movements, feminist philosophy.

[Class women's occupations in 305.43]

[.43 Occupations]

[Including housework, economic role of women] —> Class women's occupations in ~~305.3562~~. 331.4

[.48] .348 Specific kinds of women groups

Single, married, divorced, widowed; of specific racial, ethnic, national, language groups, adherent to specific religions

Class lesbianism and lesbians in 305.3562.

.5 Social classes

Class here social mobility, equality, inequality

.52 Upper classes

Royalty, nobility, aristocracies, elites, gentry, large landowners, wealthy

.55 Middle classes (Bourgeoisie)

Including managerial and entrepreneurial classes, professional classes, white-collar classes, intelligentsia

Class wealthy middle classes, intellectual elites in 305.52

.56 Lower classes

Laboring classes (proletariat); agricultural classes, e.g., peasants, sharecroppers; poor people

Including slaves, serfs; alienated and excluded classes, e.g., hobos

.6 Adherents of religious groups

Add to base number 305.6 the numbers following 2 in "Persons" notation 21–29 from Table 7, e.g., Christian Scientists 305.685; then add 0 and to the result add "Areas" notation 1–9 from Table 2, e.g., Christian Scientists in France 305.685044

.7 Language groups

Add "Languages" notation 1–9 from Table 6 to base number 305.7, e.g., English-speaking people 305.721; then add 0 and to the result add "Areas" notation 1–9 from Table 2, e.g., English-speaking people in South Africa 305.721068

.35 Other sexual/affectional relationships and roles

Premarital relations, unwed parenthood, including courtship. For marriage s. 306.8.

.353 Non-marital relationships

Class here group sex. Class prostitution in 305.354.

.354 Prostitution

.356 Homosexuality/gay life styles

Including bisexuality. For sex psyschology see 155.3.

.3561 Homosexual/gay men

.3562 Lesbianism and lesbians

.3563 Gay liberation movement

.357 Transvestism and transvestites

.358 Transexuality

.359 Other sexual behavior

Including sadism, bestiality, incest

.8 Racial, ethnic, national groups

Add "Racial, Ethnic, National Groups" notation 01–99 from Table 5 to base number 305.8, e.g., Chinese 305.8951; then, unless it is redundant, add 0 and to the result add "Areas" notation 1–9 from Table 2, e.g., Chinese in United States 305.8951073

306 Culture and institutions

Institutions: general patterns of norms defining behavior in specific social relationships

Class here cultural and social anthropology

Class cultural exchange in 303.482

For customs and folklore, see 390

[.09] Historical and geographical treatment

Do not use; class in 909, 930–990

.1 Subcultures

Groups sharing the total culture, but also having patterns of behavior peculiar to themselves

Including counterculture

Class subcultures of specific aggregates in 305

.2 Political institutions

Including military sociology

Class political science in 320, law in 340, military art and science in 355–359, police services in 363.2

.3 Economic institutions

Social arrangements for production, distribution, consumption

Examples: systems of labor, e.g., slavery, serfdom; systems of land tenure; property systems

Including sociology of economics, industrial conflict

Class economics in 330

.4 Cultural institutions

Including sociology of knowledge, science, technology, art, recreation

Class educational institutions, sociology of education in 370.19

For religious institutions, see 306.6

.6 Religious institutions

Including sociology of religion

Class social theology in 291.17, Christian social theology in 261, social theology of other religions in 292–299

.7 Institutions pertaining to relations of the sexes

Including courtship, premarital relations, unwed parenthood; incest, sadism, masochism

For marriage, see 306.8

.73 Extramarital relations

use 305.35

Class here group sex

Class prostitution in 306.74

.74 Prostitution

.76 Homosexuality

Including bisexuality

.8 Marriage and family

Class premarital and marriage counseling in 362.8286

.82 Patterns of mate selection

Class practical guides to choice of mate and dating behavior in 646.77

.83 Types of kinship systems

Patrilineal, matrilineal

.84 Types of marriage

Monogamous, polygamous Including interracial, intercultural, interreligious marriages

.85 Types of families

Patriarchal, matriarchal, nuclear, extended

Including rural and urban families, single-parent families, non-consanguinal families.

.87 Intrafamily relationships

Examples: husband-wife, parent-child, sibling relationships

Including generation gap

Class specific family problems in 362.82, manuals of sexual technique in 613.96, practical guides to harmonious family relationships in 646.78

For family dissolution, see 306.88

Appendix 4

An Analysis of Class U: Military Science

The Library of Congress schedule Class U: Military Science (4th ed., 1974) and its supplements do not provide adequate notation for materials dealing with the role of women in the military. It is possible that the inadequacies of the schedule, particularly in subclasses UA and UB (and in subclasses VA and VB of Class V: Naval Science), dealing with the organizational and administrative aspects of the military and navy, are attributable in part to the title emphasis on the military as "science" rather than "organization."

Selected comparisons with Class L: Education and Subclass KF: Law of the United States are useful in illustrating the shortcomings of the U schedule. The notations provided for the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps (UA565.W6) and the Women's reserves (UA45) do not apply or provide for analysis of women's role in mainstream military organization and administration. The same holds true for notation provisions in class V for the special women's naval units.

A report of the General Accounting Office, Job opportunities for women in the military: progress and problems, is classed in UB323, which includes all materials dealing with enlistment, recruitment, placement, promotion, and discharge in the United States military. A Brookings Institution publication, Women and the military, likewise is classed in UB323. Another generalization in classification of special needs information occurs in UB147, the inclusive number for materials on military service as a profession. Two examples: Women on the march and a film, A pride in belonging receive the general number UB147. Again, a general number, U408.5, for United States military tests and examinations, includes Tests for women in the Armed Forces: enlistment and placement opportunities for advancement.

Contrary to the practice of the U schedule is the specificity of notation provided for women's education in range LC1401 to LC2605. Still more specific is the notation provided for teachers' salaries and pensions, LB2843, which allows for topical cuttering, suggesting .W7 for materials pertinent to women teachers. Classification provisions for women also exist in subclass KF. The range from KF4891 to KF4986, election law: suffrage, provides individual numbers to particular groups of voters, including women, Afro-Americans (referred to as Negroes), and soldiers. The 1970 cumulation of additions and changes for KF expands KF390, legal works for particular groups of people, to include topical cuttering, providing .W6 for women.

Specificity of notation, however, can be a two edged sword, provided for instances of nonreciprocity. For example, the 1970 cumulation of additions and changes for class L adds LB1782 for materials dealing with teachers' wives, but does not provide similarly for materials on teachers' husbands. True, such lack of reciprocity does reflect the existing social structure (or construct, since women comprise a large proportion of the teaching profession, even if at certain levels). A similar case of nonreciprocity occurs in range UB400 to UB405, which

includes materials on soldiers' dependents, citing families, orphans, and widows, but not citing widowers. The inference is that information on military benefits to soldiers' dependents necessarily pertains to dependents of men. Again, the inference reflects the fact of male dominance and predominantly male composition of the military structure. But the accuracy of the reflection can discourage development of classification practices to accommodate innovative and alternative materials which reflect changes in and challenges to existing conditions. A recent hearing before the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, on the basis of its subject analysis, dealt in part with recognition of veterans' benefits for women. As a Senate hearing, the document was classed KF26. But as woman's role in the military increases, or as her status is equalized, a concomitant body of literature pertinent to the U schedule will appear. The existing schedule does not appear sufficient to assimilate this new information.

The index to the U schedule provides virtually no specific access points for materials on women and minorities. This is doubly unfortunate, since the inadequacies of the schedule itself need not limit the specificity of its index. Although no specific notations are provided for special needs information in UB323, UB147, and U408.5, the index, by providing entries under such headings as Sex discrimination in wages, Sex discrimination in retirement benefits, Sex discrimination in promotion and Officers, Women, could provide direct access albeit to general provisions and would infer that the general provisions included women's information and acknowledged women's role. As it is, the only index entries for women are the three see-references from Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, Women's Army Corps, and Women's reserves to the indirect main entries under United States. Army. In fact, the only direct access for a women related activity is for Prostitution, followed by the curious, if not dubious, parenthetic explicator (Military service). The indexed term accesses UH630, which is in section UH for various auxiliary military services. UH630 specifically includes works on the protection of morals and health: liquor problem, prostitution, venereal diseases, etc. It can be considered an equitable omission both in the index and schedule of class V that the term Prostitution is not used, but merely inferred from the indexed term Venereal diseases. Except for the see-references under Women's reserves, no women specific term is indexed in class V.

Parenthetically, the terminology of the index reflects the biases and omissions of conventional English usage. The term Airmen is either assumed to apply to both sexes or infers that women do not serve as air personnel. The term manpower is used for the entire human component of the military.

An index expanded by inclusion of new and specific access points to a schedule which itself lacks specific accommodations runs the risk of indexing nonexisting subject matter. The possibility of blind indexing necessitates a theoretical guideline, or justification, for accessing provisions in the schedule currently used for special materials lacking explicit notation. By explicit notation, I mean the existence in the schedule of a number and its verbal definition. For example, under Clothing and equipment/Uniforms, UC460-535, "UC487... Buttons" is an explicit notation. Other sections in the schedule have broad topical headings for which appropriate specific subordinate topics have to be

implied. For example, under the broad heading Military life, manners and customs, antiquities, etc., U750-773, there is a chronological arrangement, Ancient, Medieval, Modern, with a geographical subarrangement under Modern, but no topical suggestions. There is no way to ascertain from the index that books on army wives are classed in this section. It can be ascertained using the LC Subject Headings, which cites U750-773 following its broad heading for Military life. I surmise from actual examples of LC classification that three broad categories -- (1) Enlistment, recruitment, placement, (2) Military education and training, (3) Military service as a profession -- do, in terms of current usage, imply comprehensive inclusion of materials specific to particular groups.

The fundamental task, addressed below, is deciding the real adequacy of the schedule, determining if its provisions are in fact, not just in practice, comprehensive. The immediate problem is providing access to the provisions in use for an existing and growing body of special information, which are the same provisions which previously accommodated a body of literature directed at a predominantly male, white, heterosexual organization. I suggest that by adding specific terms to the index -- e.g. Officers, Women; Veterans, Women; Military education for women; nonmilitary education for women -- we can identify the non-explicit, but existing, content of the schedules. I do not believe that such "implicit indexing" is blind indexing.

Implicit indexing can demonstrate the way in which the schedule currently is applied, but does not resolve its fundamental adequacy. The adequacy of the schedule can be determined by deciding its original intent and content. One important premise is that the LC schedules were conceived and presented as a practical, not theoretical, classification system, intended to accommodate an existing, not projected, collection. When the U schedule first was published in 1910, it is unlikely that it applied to an existing literature as diversified as the current expanding literature. It is interesting that several other schedules and their revisions have provisions for literature pertaining to women in various occupations. The H schedule provides explicit notation for women bankers, the L schedule provides for women teachers, K for women lawyers and jurors, R for women physicians, etc. Regarding both LC's requirement of practical justification for notation and its frequent practice of establishing explicit notation for literature pertaining to women in various occupations, it increasingly appears unlikely that schedule notations were intended to be comprehensive. In particular, the addition of a provision for women bankers (established in class H cumulation of additions and changes through 19[illegible]) appears to admit that, until recently, women had no recognizable role in banking, that no specific literature existed in LC collections, and that, by default, the notations provided for banking personnel applied to a literature whose subject and audience was male. I argue analogically that the intent and content of the U schedule provisions for literature on military personnel pertained to an organization whose mainstream goals and activities were expedited by males. The established notations did not intend the current literature on women's expanding role in the mainstream military and, therefore, are viewed inadequate and not in keeping with practices observed in other schedules.

The preface of the 4th edition of the U schedule indicates that provisions of earlier editions required extensive additions to accommodate the technological innovations of the two World Wars. It is my opinion that sociological or socio-organizational innovations within the military warrant schedule additions on an equal basis with technological innovations. The preference given by LC to the technical and tactical concerns of the military has created at least one situation contradicting LC practice by providing a range of numbers for which no entries exist in its shelf list. Under five transportation notations, UC347, Motorcycles, UC349 Coolies, UC350 Camels, elephants, etc., UC355 Dogs, UC360, Skates, snow-shoes, etc., no shelf listings occur. A perusal of the LC Subjects Catalog indicates that books on such methods of military transport pertain more to events than tactics, and are classed in geographical and historical context. For example, the book War-Horse and Elephant in the Delhi Sultanate is classed in DS485. Also, provisions under World War I in the D schedule include special topics Dogs, D639. D6, and Snowshoes and snowshoeing, D639.S5. I refer to this range of purely gratuitous notations not so much because it contradicts the policy of practical justification, but because it provides an example of LC priorities in establishing and expanding U schedule provisions. Technical and tactical sections of the U schedule, employing such schedule expansion techniques as number addition, decimal expansion, and topical cuttering, can serve both as precedent and example for similar expansions in sections describing the social organization and human composition of the military.

Postscript:

The April-June, 1979, LC Classification Additions and Changes (List 194) expands the notation provisions between UB410 and UB420 by creating UB416 to UB419 (numbers not previously in use) to arrange materials pertaining to women and minorities in military administration. Particular specificity is provided for subarrangement of works pertaining to United States military administration, for which UB417 is reserved for general works, and for which UB418 is reserved for individual groups cuttered A-Z, with .A47 for Afro-Americans and .W65 for Women. In addition, appropriate, nonpejorative terms are included in the index, including necessary cross-references. In the V (Naval Science) schedule, there is parallel expansion in VB for arrangement of materials pertaining to women and minorities in naval administration.

While this expansion does not solve the general inadequacy of the U (or V) schedule and index, it does indicate the Library of Congress's recognition that inadequacies do exist. What the postscript to the foregoing analysis seeks to articulate is that the investigation of the U schedule should be viewed as one effort or prototype vehicle to establish a methodology and standard by which other schedules can be analyzed for fair and adequate provisions for materials on women and minorities in all disciplines and occupations.

As a methodology: In the short run, to identify schedule notations which "imply" inclusion of materials on women and, on that basis, supply "implicit indexing."
In the long run, to analyze the "fundamental adequacy" of the notations in terms of initial, or "original intent" to be comprehensive, and to establish new notations or expand existing notations when fundamental inadequacies are ascertained.

As a standard: When analyzing and expanding classification schedules, to place at least equal emphasis on the literature which examines the human

Appendix 5

RTSD CCS Subject Analysis Committee

Subcommittee on Racism and Sexism in Subject Analysis

Annotated Bibliography of materials
relating to language, subject analysis, and women

This is a selective and, for the most part, annotated listing of materials on terminology relating to women. These works fall into several categories: 1.) Books and articles on sexism in language. (Key, Miller and Casey, Nielsen, Stainchamps) 2.) Lists and thesauri (Marshall - On equal terms, Buffalo and Erie County Public Library list, Dictionary of occupational titles, NOW index to its classification scheme, YWCA list) 3.) Books and articles on sex-biased LCSH subject headings and alternatives for their revision (Berman, two Dickinson articles, Marshall article on LC labeling, Wolf) 4.) Bibliographies and citations ("People-related alternatives", Henley and Thorne) 5.) Classification schedules (Dickinson, NOW classification schedule). Citation covers Dewey only. No study of LC classification as it relates to materials on women seems to have been done.

Berman, Sanford. "Man/Woman/Sex", Prejudices and antipathies: a tract on the LC subject headings concerning people. Metuchen, N.J. : Scarecrow Press, 1971, p. 174-205.

Prejudices and antipathies is the seminal work on subject terminology applied to people, and one of the first works to document sex-bias in LCSH and Sears. Headings are itemized and alternative, non-sexist, terms are listed with sources for precedent. Many of Berman's recommended forms have since been adopted by LC.

Buffalo and Erie County Public Library, Buffalo, N.Y. "Subject headings list: women's library", Unabashed librarian 14 (Winter 1975), p. 32.

Dickinson, Liz, and others. "Hennepin County Library expands Dewey numbers for women and men", Unabashed Librarian 14 (Winter 1975), p. 25-26.

Outlines expanded scheme under 301.41 to allow for more specificity in classification. Separate numbers are given for materials on women in the following aspects: Philosophy (including feminism), consciousness-raising groups, social conditions and political activity, economic conditions, stereotypes and discrimination, lifestyles, history, (including separate extension for Women's Liberation Movement). Similar patterns are suggested for materials relating to the social role and function of men. Greater specificity and updated captions are used for homosexual/gay life styles.

(See also "New and revised DDC notations", Hennepin County Library Cataloging Bulletin, #11/12/13 (March 15, 1975), p. 13-16).

Dickinson, Elizabeth. "Statement to the RTSD CCS Subject Analysis Committee on Sex-biased Library of Congress Subject Headings". (July 10, 1974; Revised August 1979), available from the author: Stockton Public Library, 605 No. El Dorado St., Stockton, CA 95203.

This document was presented to the Subject Analysis Committe by the SRRT

Task Force on Women Committee on Sex-biased Terminology, and was accepted in principle by the SAC. It outlines specific categories of sex-biased terminology prevalent in Library of Congress Subject Headings 7th edition and updates through summer 1974. The categories identified include the "MAN/WOMAN generic problem", "Subsuming terminology", the "modifier tactic", "separate and unequal treatment", "omissions: headings", and "omissions: cross references".

Dickinson, Elizabeth. "The word game", Canadian Library Journal, v. 31, no. 4 (August 1974), p. 338-343.

This article discribes subject headings used by the Hennepin County Library as alternatives to LCSH terminology described as sex-biased. Discusses the link between linguistic discrimination and socio-political discrimination.

Henley, Nancy and Barrie Thorne. She said/he said. Pittsburgh, PA : Know, inc., 1975. 311 p.

First published as: Language and sex: difference and dominance. This is, as its subtitle reads, "an annotated bibliography of sex differences in language, speech, and nonverbal communication."

Key, Mary Ritchie. Male/female language. Metuchen, N.J. : Scarecrow Press, 1975. 200 p.

Review by E. Dickinson from Hennepin County Library Cataloging Bulletin #16, p. 29:

"The crux of Key's thesis is: "To live an androgynous life, one must have an androgynous language" (p. 147). Her argument goes far beyond a gut-level observation that language tongue-ties and strait-jackets women into patterns of speech that are ineffective judged against the male-dominated norm. Key amply documents (the work includes 20 pages of footnotes and another 20 of bibliography) that in patrilineal societies males and females utilize different words, phrases and often variant linguistic structures. The disparate linguistic patterns both reflect and affect the roles that various cultures assign to males and females. Key believes that eventually an androgynous language will evolve which will embrace a balanced tension--supporting rather than opposing. It will be exuberant and vibrant, leaving out the weak and the brutal. It will not tolerate the simpering, helpless, bitchy sweetness of the 'feminine' language. Nor will it tolerate the overwhelming smash of the opinionated and blustering 'masculine' language. It will move away from the cruel distinctions that have wounded both male and female human beings" (p. 147)."

Marshall, Joan. "LC labeling : an indictment", Revolting librarians (Celeste West and Elizabeth Katz, ed.) San Francisco : Booklegger Press, 1972, p. 45-49.

Blasts Hagkin's axiom "that the reader is the focus in all cataloging principles and practices": the reader cannot validly be identified,

and the practice of using majority norms contributes to bias. Examples of LCSH bias, including sex-biased terminology, are given.

Marshall, Joan K. On equal terms : a thesaurus for non-sexist indexing and cataloging. N.Y. : Neal Schuman Publishers, c1977. 152 p.

Joan Marshall's thesaurus puts into practice six "principles for establishing subject headings relating to people and peoples": 1. Use the authentic name of the group as preferred by the people themselves. 2. Use neutrality in establishing subdivisions; make sure subdivision structure is parallel. 3. Make sure that heading terminology and structure for minority and other groups does not differ from usage for the majority. 4. "Be specific and current." 5. "Do not use subsuming terminology." 6. "Do not allow huge files of indifferentiated cards to accumulate under a heading."

Marshall's application of these rules for terminology relating to women is comprehensive, detailed, and well-organized. References and notes are included. Where LSCH practice varies from Marshall's preferred headings this difference is noted. Precedence is cited for Marshall's choices where applicable.

The principles outlined by Marshall have been accepted by the Subject Analysis Committee, and Marshall's work is used as an authoritative source for subject heading assignment in this area.

Miller, Casey and Kate Swift. Words and women. N.Y. : Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1976. 197 p.

Reviewed by E. Dickinson in HCL Cataloging Bulletin, #23/24, p. 58-9:

"Words and women is not a scholarly dissertation on the subject of sex-biased terminology. The aim of the journalist-authors is to bring together scientific research, historical and etymological studies, and observations from advertisements and other media, recasting it in a format that is understandable and even entertaining to the layperson. It popularizes linguistics in much the same way I'm OK, You're OK popularized psychology. Despite a somewhat rambling style and some anecdotes that are not entirely convincing, the book should convince [most critics] that (a) There is a problem built into our linguistic structure and terminology. (b) Equity will be served and some good will be derived through androgynous or "unisex" terminology applied sensibly through tests of accuracy, inclusiveness, exactness or usefulness. (c) Changes so applied will withstand the test of time and will enhance our language rather than render it 'graceless.'"

Nielsen, Alleen Pace, et.al., Sexism and language. Urbana, Il : National Council Council of Teachers of English, c1977. 203 p.

The authors discuss how the structure and vocabulary of our language shape our sex roles. Gives examples of sexist terms. Includes "Guidelines for Nonsexist Use of Language in NCTE publications."

National Organization for Women. Library/Resource Center, "Classification System for N.O.W. Library/Resource Center," July 1979 (Typed manuscript), 15 p.

The N.O.W. Library organizes its specialized collection by an abbreviated decimal system: 0. General Works; 1. N.O.W.; 2. E.R.A.; 3. Societal equality; 4. Human rights; 5. Economic rights; 6. Opposition; 7. Government; 8. Other issues; 9. Women's movement/general. These broad categories are further subdivided numerically, for example, legislation of the 95th Congress for the Susan B. Anthony coin falls in 7.25.13. While this list is organization-specific and covers much current topical ground, many special women's collections would benefit from examining this classification scheme. The topics covered would also be enlightening to catalogers of generalized collections as an example of the breadth of material that must be wedged into our limited general classification schedules.

National Organization for Women. Library/Resource Center," Index to Classification System for N.O.W. Library/Resource Center," July 1979 (Typed manuscript), 8 p.

The index is to be used in conjunction with the numerically-based N.O.W. Library Classification schedule. The index could use a redraft to improve upon comprehensiveness, accuracy, and selection of index terms. The index, for example, lists "Pregnancy, disability" in 5.8. The list contains some "as" and "in" forms, e.g., "Women in business," "Women as criminals." A study of this list is useful, however, for determining some appropriate heading and cross reference forms, and for determining the names of organizations (e.g., Women Against Violence Against Women.)

" 'People'-related alternatives : a selection of HCL heads", Hennepin County Library Cataloging Bulletin, #23/24 (May 1, 1976), p. 42-45.

Includes terms relating to women used by the Hennepin County Library as alternatives to LCSH practice.

Strainchamps, Ethel. "Our sexist language." (In Woman in sexist society : studies in power and powerlessness, ed. Vivian Gornick and Barbara K. Moran : New York : New American Library, 1972, c1971), p. 347-361.

Discusses the cultural role of language as mind-shaper as well as the reflector of human thought. Traces dictionary definitions and the writings of linguists on male/female terminology.

United States. Employment Service. Dictionary of occupational titles. 4th ed. Washington, D.C. : GPO, 1977. 1371 p.

The Dictionary was updated to eliminate sex-biased terminology several years ago and is an authoritative source for job-related headings.

(See also U.S. Manpower Administration. Job title revisions to eliminate sex - and age - referrant language from the Dictionary of occupational titles, 3d ed., 1975.)

Wolf, Steve. "Catalogers in revolt against LC's racist, sexist headings", Interracial Books For Children Bulletin, v.6, no. 3/4 (1975), p. 3, 16.

Describes Hennepin County Library alternatives to racist and sexist subject terminology.

Young Women's Christian Association. National Board Library. Subject headings on women used in the Library of the National Board YWCA. Rev. ed. N.Y. : YWCA, 1973. 3 p.

From HCL Catalog Bulletin, #2 (July 13, 1973), p. 14:

"In a note preceding the roster of over 100 descriptors, Librarian Elizabeth D. Norris explains that "the Library of Congress headings, WOMEN AS AUTHORS or WOMEN AS SCIENTISTS, have been replaced by the less chauvinist and more accurate forms, WOMEN AUTHORS, WOMEN SCIENTISTS. When material on other occupations is received, headings are added accordingly, e.g., WOMEN ASTRONAUTS." Also available in the Cataloging Section is Ms. Norris' 21-page "special subject heading list" on intergroup relations, produced for the National Conference of Christians and Jews' Paula K. Lazrus Memorial Library (N.Y.: 1963). Notable in that 10-year-old compilation are such terms as ETHNIC RELATIONS, INTEGRATED HOUSING, NEO-NAZISM, POLICE-COMMUNITY RELATIONS, RACE RELATIONS, and RACISM, which--though obviously relevant and useful--have not yet been incorporated into the LC-scheme. Further, an appendix helpfully provides many "selected definitions."

(See also: "Subject headings on women used in the Library of the National Board YWCA : a collection on the contemporary American woman and her interests," Unabashed Librarian 9 (Fall 1973), p. 16-17.

Revised, Jan. 1980

APPENDIX 6 (REVISED)

RTSD CCS SUBJECT ANALYSIS COMMITTEE
Subcommittee on Racism and Sexism in
Subject Analysis

Annotated Bibliography of Materials on Terminology
and Subject Analysis Relating to Blacks

This is a selective annotated bibliography on terminology relating to Black Americans. All of the items are research studies. One a dissertation, another an article, two are unpublished papers presented at an institute (Clack has written in each category) and the last is a handbook useful in the organization of materials by and about Blacks. These citations cover Dewey and LC Classification as well as LC Subject Headings.

Clack, Doris H. "The Adequacy of Library of Congress Subject Headings for Black Literature Resources." LRTS, 22 (Spring, 1978) 137-144.

Subject analysis for Black literature resources is a neglected area in research. This investigation of LC subject headings assigned to Black literature resources is concerned with determining the adequacy of subject analysis of these materials in terms of specificity of headings. The extent to which these subject headings are coextensive with the subject treated in the works is a determining factor in the ease or difficulty experienced in subject catalog searches and is thus examined. The question of adequacy is explored. The study concludes with a description of presecriptive measures necessary for the resolution of the problem identified.

_____. An Investigation into the Adequacy of Library of Congress Subject Headings for Resources for Black Studies. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation prepared for the Graduate School of Library and Information Sciences, University of Pittsburgh, 1973.

A detailed research study of relevant LC subject headings in an attempt to determine the extent to which they are adequate for the retrieval of Black resources from a general collection. The researcher hypothesized that the subject headings vary in adequacy on levels from one (highest) to seven (least). The findings revealed the examined headings inadequate because less than half of the materials were retrievable. Recommendations for important improvements were made.

_____. "The Cataloging of Afro-American Literature: Subject Headings and Classification," in Bibliographical Control of Afro-American Literature. 1976.

Author examines Dewey and LC, the major tools of subject analysis in the United States, and reveals specific areas of weakness in both for

Afro-American literature. Recommends continued research and examination of PRECIS as an indexing alternative.

Cazart, Jean Elder. A Handbook for the Organization of Black Materials. Prepared for the Institute on the Selection, Organization and Use of Materials By and About the Negro. Nashville, Tenn., Fisk University, 1971.

Matthews, Geraldine O. "Bibliographic Control of Afro-American Literature: An Analysis of Selected Items," in Bibliographical Control of Afro-American Literature.

The researcher investigated the adequacy of subject classification. Two approaches were used in analysis. 1) discusses selected materials as organized in the 'precoordinate system'. The materials represented Dewey 301.451 and LC185 classes. 2) made a presentation of the faceted technique to one subject on how it would be applied in the 'post coordinate system'. The researcher concluded that a more thorough detailed investigation was needed and detailed recommendations.